

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF VERMONT

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF VERMONT  
FILED

2021 JUL -6 PM 4:15

CLERK

BY

DEPUTY CLERK

*(Signature)*

KIMBERLY D. CROSSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NORTH COUNTRY FEDERAL CREDIT  
UNION; ROBERT MORGAN, CEO;  
MELISSA JEWETT

v.

ANDREW SOLL; SOCIAL SECURITY  
ADMINISTRATION

v.

TOWN OF BRIGHTON ISLAND POND;  
JOEL T. COPE; MICHAEL STRAIT;  
JEFFREY NOYES

v.

T.J. DONOVAN

v.

ROBERT MCKENNA; HUGH  
O'DONNELL; SEAN BRENNAN;  
MATTHEW BIRMINGHAM

v.

MARY HARE; JEFFREY HARE

v.

MICHAEL HARRINGTON

v.

Case No. 5:21-cv-68

Case No. 5:21-cv-71

Case No. 5:21-cv-72

Case No. 5:21-cv-76

Case No. 5:21-cv-77

Case No. 5:21-cv-78

Case No. 5:21-cv-79



ADAM DIONNE	)	Case No. 5:21-cv-92
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
KEVIN J. BICKFORD; DEVIL,	)	Case No. 5:21-cv-93
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF LABOR;	)	Case No. 5:21-cv-94
ERIC HARRINGTON; MICHELE	)	
BROWN; ROGER V.; T.J. DONOVAN;	)	
PHIL SCOTT; BERNIE SANDERS; GAIL	)	
IRELAND; PATRICK LEAHY; PETER	)	
WELCH; DEVIL; DIRK ANDERSON;	)	
STATE REPS; GOVERNMENT	)	
OFFICIALS,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE;	)	Case No. 5:21-cv-97
STEVE WRIGHT; AARON WHITCOMB,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

### ORDER OF DISMISSAL

In March 2021, Plaintiff Kimberly D. Crosson, representing herself, submitted eighteen proposed Complaints. She sought to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), or without prepayment of fees, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. By Order dated May 25, 2021, because Plaintiff’s applications made the showing required under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), her requests to proceed IFP were granted. The court dismissed all of the proposed Complaints under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). In light of Plaintiff’s self-represented status, Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to amend her pleadings on or before June 25, 2021, and warned that failure to file an Amended Complaint would result in closure of the cases. To date, no further filings have been received. Consequently, these cases are DISMISSED; the Clerk of Court is directed to close the case files.

Ms. Crosson has now sought IFP status in the District of Vermont on 28 occasions. In each of those cases, the court granted the IFP motions, however, the proposed Complaints were

dismissed after the required review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). District courts have the power and the obligation to protect the public and the efficient administration of justice from individuals who have a history of litigation entailing vexation, harassment and needless expense to [other parties] and an unnecessary burden on the courts and their supporting personnel.” *Lau v. Meddaugh*, 229 F.3d 121, 123 (2d Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted); *Safir v. U.S. Lines, Inc.*, 792 F.2d 19, 23 (2d Cir. 1986) (“A district court not only may but should protect its ability to carry out its constitutional functions against the threat of onerous, multiplicitous, and baseless litigation.”) (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, the court may prohibit an individual from filing new actions in the venue when he or she “abuse[s] the process of the [c]ourts to harass and annoy others with meritless, frivolous, vexatious[,] or repetitive [filings.]” *In re Hartford Textile Corp.*, 659 F.2d 299, 305 (2d Cir. 1981). In light of her history of filing groundless lawsuits, Ms. Crosson is warned that future frivolous filings in this District may result in a filing injunction.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Rutland, in the District of Vermont, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July 2021.



Geoffrey W. Crawford, Chief Judge  
United States District Court